



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/783,779	02/20/2004	Yu Gong	50277-2334	6676

29989 7590 10/18/2007  
HICKMAN PALERMO TRUONG & BECKER, LLP  
2055 GATEWAY PLACE  
SUITE 550  
SAN JOSE, CA 95110

EXAMINER
----------

HARPER, LEON JONATHAN

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2166

MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
-----------	---------------

10/18/2007

PAPER

**Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.**

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

<b>Office Action Summary</b>	<b>Application No.</b> 10/783,779	<b>Applicant(s)</b> GONG, YU	
	<b>Examiner</b> Leon J. Harper	<b>Art Unit</b> 2166	

**-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --**

**Period for Reply**

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

**Status**

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 07 August 2007.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**.                      2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

**Disposition of Claims**

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 78-99 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 78-99 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

**Application Papers**

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

**Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119**

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All    b) ☐ Some    c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

**Attachment(s)**

- |  |   |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)            | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)           |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)   | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____                                      |
| 3) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
| Paper No(s)/Mail Date <u>7/19/2007</u> .   | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____                          |

## **DETAILED ACTION**

### ***Continued Examination Under 37 CFR 1.114***

1. A request for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, including the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e), was filed in this application after final rejection. Since this application is eligible for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, and the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e) has been timely paid, the finality of the previous Office action has been withdrawn pursuant to 37 CFR 1.114. Applicant's submission filed on 8/7/2007 has been entered. Claims 1-37, 45-77 have been cancelled. Claims 78-99 have been added. Accordingly, claims 78-99 are pending in this office action.

### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

The factual inquiries set forth in *Graham v. John Deere Co.*, 383 U.S. 1, 148 USPQ 459 (1966), that are applied for establishing a background for determining obviousness under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) are summarized as follows:

1. Determining the scope and contents of the prior art.
2. Ascertaining the differences between the prior art and the claims at issue.
3. Resolving the level of ordinary skill in the pertinent art.
4. Considering objective evidence present in the application indicating obviousness or nonobviousness.

Claims 78-99 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over US 5890167 (hereinafter Bridge) in view of US 20040034615 (hereinafter Thom).

As for claim 78 Bridge discloses: receiving, from a user, input that selects a plurality of database objects to be transported from a source database to a target database (See column 7 lines 23-27 and See column 6 lines 40-44). While Bridge does not substantially differ from the claimed invention the disclosure of, wherein the plurality of database objects includes at least one of: a view, a sequence, a dimension, a cube, an ETL mapping, a queue, an external table, a stored procedure, or a database object, wherein the metadata for the database object is stored outside of the source database and the target database; reading metadata about each selected object to determine a manner in which to transport the selected objects to the target database; storing meta-metadata that indicates the manner in which to transport the selected objects to the target database; and based on the meta-metadata, performing operations to transport the selected objects to the target database. Thom however does explicitly disclose wherein the plurality of database objects includes at least one of: a view, a sequence, a dimension, a cube, an ETL mapping, a queue, an external table, a stored procedure, or a database object, wherein the metadata for the database object is stored outside of the source database and the target database; reading metadata about each selected object to determine a manner in which to transport the selected objects to the target database; storing meta-metadata that indicates the manner in which to transport the selected objects to the target database; and based on the meta-metadata, performing operations

Art Unit: 2166

to transport the selected objects to the target database. (See paragraph 0009). ). It would have been obvious to an artisan of ordinary skill in the pertinent art to have incorporated the teaching of Thom into the system of Bridge. The modification would have been obvious because users want to have the ability to extract and translate databases from one form to another (See Thom paragraph 0011).

As for claim 79 the rejection of claim 78 is incorporated and further Thom discloses in response to a failure occurring during the transport of any of the selected objects to the target database, rolling back all changes made during the transport of the selected objects to the target database (See paragraph 0066).

As for claim 80 the rejection of claim 78 is incorporated and further Thom discloses wherein the selected objects includes a database object that has metadata stored outside of the source database, and further wherein reading the metadata includes reading the metadata from a source repository outside of the source database (See paragraphs 0151-0153).

As for claim 81 the rejection of claim 80 is incorporated and further Thom discloses: wherein a source database server manages data from the source database, a target database server manages data from the target database, and the source

Art Unit: 2166

repository is a repository associated with an application separate from both the source database server and the target database server (See paragraphs 0037,0046,0054).

As for claim 82 the rejection of claim 81 is incorporated, and further Thom discloses: wherein the application is an extraction, transformation and loading application (See paragraph 0009)

As for claim 83 the rejection of claim 78 is incorporated, and further Thom discloses: wherein reading metadata about each selected object includes reading metadata from the source database (See paragraph 0095).

As for claim 84 the rejection of claim 78 is incorporated, and further Thom discloses: analyzing the metadata about each selected object for dependencies (See paragraph 0009).

As for claim 85 the rejection of claim 84 is incorporated, and further Thom discloses: wherein analyzing the metadata for dependencies includes analyzing the metadata to ensure proper order of loading of the metadata into the target database.(See paragraph 0046, 0107).

Claims 86-93 contain essentially the same limitations as claims 78-85 and are thus rejected for the same reasons as claims 78-85.

Claims 94-99 contain essentially the same limitations as claims 78-80,83-84 and are thus rejected for the same reasons as claims 78-80,83-85.

### Information

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Leon J. Harper whose telephone number is 571-272-0759. The examiner can normally be reached on 7:30AM - 4:00PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Hosain T. Alam can be reached on 571-272-3978. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

LJH  
Leon J. Harper  
October 14, 2007

  
HOSAIN ALAM  
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER